



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/134,472	08/14/1998	DOUGLAS T. ROSS	227662XY4-S	8035

29728 7590 11/26/2002

GUILFORD PHARMACEUTICALS C/O  
FOLEY & LARDNER  
3000 K STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20007-5143

EXAMINER

OWENS JR, HOWARD V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1623

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2002

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

11/26/02

*Date mailed*

Paper No. 19

Application Number: 09/134,472

Filing Date: August 14, 1998

Appellant(s): ROSS ET AL.

James T. Carmichael  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 4-2-02.

**(1) *Real Party in Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

Art Unit: 1623

**(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences***

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

**(3) *Status of Claims***

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is substantially correct. The changes are as follows:

The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 1-4,6-11 and 23-38 over S.N. 09/453,571, now U.S. Patent No. 6,331,537 has been withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38 over claims 16-23 of S.N. 09/453,571, now U.S. Patent No. 6,331,537, has been amended to reflect the issued claims in '537. Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38 are now rejected over claim 8 of '537.

**(4) *Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) *Summary of Invention***

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) *Issues***

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is substantially correct. The change is as follows:

The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 1-4,6-11 and 23-38 over S.N. 09/453,571, now U.S. Patent No. 6,331,537 has been withdrawn and is thus no longer an issue.

The Double patenting issue with regards to S.N. 09/453,571 is now whether claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38 were improperly rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting over claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,331,537.

## **(7) Grouping of Claims**

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11 and 23-38 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

**(8) *ClaimsAppealed***

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(9) Prior Art of Record**

6,140,357 HAMILTON et al 10-2000

Co-pending U.S. Application no. 09/453,571, now U.S. Patent No. 6,331,537.

## **(10) *Grounds of Rejection***

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA

1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,140,357. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are drawn to a method of effecting or treating neuronal activity in an animal with the same or analogous compounds.

The claims of the instant application differ only through the claim language of treating vision disorders; however, the basis of the treatment is "nerve related". As acknowledged by applicant in the interview of 11/28/00 and an amendment to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112(1) rejection of record, the basis of the invention is treating the neurological basis or etiology of the vision disorder or memory impairment. Given that the claims of '357 are drawn to treating or effecting neuronal activity via stimulation of damaged neurons, promotion of neuronal regulation and treatment of a neurological disorder using the same compounds set forth in the instant application, one of skill in the art would certainly have a reasonable expectation of success in the use of these compounds to treat conditions which have a neurological basis as well as be provided with the motivation to use these compounds for disorders which have a neurological etiology.

Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,331,537 ('537). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are drawn to a method of effecting or treating neuronal activity in an animal with the same or analogous N-heterocyclic compounds. The claims of the instant application differ only through the claim language of treating vision disorders; however, the basis of the treatment is "nerve related". As acknowledged by applicant in the interview of 11/28/00 and the amendment filed 12/5/00 to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112(1) rejection of record, the basis of the invention is treating the neurological basis or etiology of the vision disorder or memory impairment. Given that claim 8 of '537 is drawn to treating a neurological disorder in an animal comprising administering an analogous compound to stimulate growth of damaged peripheral nerves or to promote neuronal regeneration, one of skill in the art would certainly have a reasonable expectation of success in the use of these compounds to treat conditions which have a neurological basis, as well as be provided with the motivation to use these compounds for disorders which have a neurological etiology, such as nerve related vision disorders or nerve related memory impairments.

### 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,140,357.

Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38 are drawn to a method of treating a nerve related vision disorder or treating memory impairment in a mammal in need thereof via administration of an N-heterocyclic ring compound containing a carbocyclic acid isostere moiety thereof attached to the 2-carbon of the N-heterocyclic ring.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Hamilton et al. teaches a method of treating or effecting neuronal activity via stimulation of damaged neurons, promotion of neuronal regulation and treatment of a neurological disorder with the analogous compounds set forth in the instant claims.

Hamilton et al. teaches that these immunophillin ligands do not exert any significant immunosuppressive activity in addition to their neurotrophic activity (col. 2, line 39 - col. 18). Hamilton also teaches the use of these compounds for the treatment of memory impairment such as Alzheimer's disease (col. 2, lines 39-52 and col. 11, lines 15-17).

Although Hamilton does not specifically mention all of the vision disorders cited, the treatment target in Hamilton is neuronal activity and the basis of the treatment of the

instant claims is neurological or "nerve related" eye diseases which adequately bridges the nexus between the differences in the prior art and the invention as claimed.

It would have been prima facie obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the N-heterocyclic ring compound containing a carboxylic acid to treat nerve related vision disorders or memory impairment.

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the analogous compounds for the treatment of nerve related vision disorders or memory impairments given the general use of these compounds in the prior art for stimulation of damaged neurons, promotion of neuronal regulation and treatment of neurological disorders; as well as the non-immunosuppressive activity displayed by these N-heterocyclic compounds.

***(11) Response to Argument***

**Double Patenting Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38 over U.S. Patent No. 6,140,357**

Appellant's arguments in the brief filed 4-2-02, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38 under double patenting over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,140,357 ('357) is maintained for the reasons set forth below.

Appellant' central argument is that the compounds claimed in '357 are different from those claimed instantly because the substituent at the 2-position is not permitted to be either an ester or amide and is not permitted to be further substituted. Appellant should note that the claim language of the instant claims specifically recites a carboxylic acid or

Art Unit: 1623

carboxylic acid isostere. An isostere is a compound resulting from the exchange of an atom or a group of atoms with another, broadly similar, atom or group of atoms. As such, claims 1-11 of '357 wherein a substituted carboxylate is present when Y= O is equivalent to an isostere of carboxylic acid, since the only difference between the carboxylate and the carboxylic acid is the presence or absence of a hydrogen atom. Appellant's claim that the 2-position is not permitted to be either an ester or amide is also clearly refuted by the claims as the instant claims, specifically claim 11, recite an amide as a 2-position isostere (p.25 of claims submitted with appeal brief), as well as phosphate esters (p. 35 of claims submitted with appeal brief) as substituents. Thus, applicant's assertion that the rejection should fall because the compounds of the invention are limited to carboxylic acids as 2-position substituents is not supported by the compounds recited in the instant claims.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-11 of '357 are generic to all that is recited in instant claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38 . Specifically, instant claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38 fall entirely within the scope of claims 1-11 of '357. Appellant claims that there is no technical or factual basis, however as cited supra, the claims of the instant application differ only through the claim language of treating vision disorders; however, the basis of the treatment is "nerve related". As acknowledged by applicant in the interview of 11/28/00 and the amendment filed 12/5/00 to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112(1) rejection of record, the basis of the instantly claimed invention is treating the neurological basis or etiology of the vision disorder or memory impairment (emphasis added). Given that the claims of

'357 are drawn to treating or affecting neuronal activity via stimulation of damaged neurons, promotion of neuronal regulation and treatment of a neurological disorder using FKBP-type immunophilin ligands as set forth in the instant application, one of skill in the art would certainly have a reasonable expectation of success in the use of these compounds to treat conditions which have a neurological basis as well as be provided with the motivation to use these compounds for disorders which have a neurological etiology or constitute neuronal degeneration. Appellant has not provided a specific response to the reasoning cited supra, only the statement that there is no technical or factual basis; moreover, appellant has provided no evidence to demonstrate that the generic teachings of '357 with regard to the treatment of neurological disorders or neurodegeneration with the same immunophilin ligand does not provide a nexus for treating neurological disorders which affect vision and memory. Use of the terms vision and memory, do not mask the fact that the scope of the claims is rooted in the treatment of the neuronal activity or neurodegeneration, the vision and memory disorders are treated when the neuronal activity or neurodegeneration is treated first, not vice versa.

Given that vision and memory are two distinct systems, one of skill in the art would not assume that the treatment of disorders which affect these systems with the same compounds could be accomplished unless there was a biochemical pathway common to both which is being modulated, the nexus for the treatment of these diverse systems in the instant claims is clearly neurodegeneration which can effect either one of these systems. Appellant's arguments support this rationale, as cited by appellant on p.7 of the instant brief, "The record reflects that compounds such as Imipramine used for

treating symptoms associated with Alzheimer's disease are not effective for treating memory impairment, and there is also no expectation that such compounds would be effective in treating vision disorders".

Appellant previously amended the claims to include the neurological basis because it was clear that there was no support in the specification for the treatment of vision and memory disorders broadly with the compounds of the invention, i.e. glaucoma, cataracts, myopia, amnesia, which are all conditions which effect vision or memory, yet the compounds of the invention had no support for these conditions or the multitude of conditions which are encompassed by the terms "vision and memory disorder". The scope of the claims is actually neurological disorders that effect vision and memory, not vision and memory disorders which affect neurological disorders. The scope of the claims is such that the treatment of the multitude of disorders set forth in the instant claims has no basis of treatment with the compounds of the invention without the recognition that the cause of these disorders, must be neurological (emphasis added). The terms "vision" and "memory" reference the biological system which is ultimately affected via treatment of a neurological or nerve related condition.

As such, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to use the FKBP-type immunophilin ligand compounds of '357 known to treat or affect neuronal activity via stimulation of damaged neurons, promotion of neuronal regulation and treatment of a neurological disorder in a method of treatment for a neurological disorder, such as damaged or degenerative neurons, which effects either vision or memory. The examiner maintains the position that the scope of the instant claims drawn to treatment of nerve related

conditions with the claimed compounds is encompassed by the use of the same class of compounds in '357 to treat or affect neuronal activity via stimulation of damaged neurons, promotion of neuronal regulation and treatment of a neurological disorder.

Double Patenting Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38 over U.S. Patent No. 6,331,537

Appellant's arguments in the brief filed 4-2-02, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38 under double patenting over claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,331,537 ('537) is maintained for the reasons set forth below.

Appellant presumes that the scope of the claims disregards the neurological etiology of the various conditions set forth in the instant claims, as well as that the scope of the claims of '537 does not encompass nerve related vision disorders or nerve related memory impairments.

Appellant should note that a double patenting rejection is supported over claims of applications and patents (see MPEP, 804, section II), not the disclosure, thus applicant's arguments regarding the teachings in the disclosure of Serial No. '571 is moot.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 8 of '537 is generic to all that is recited in instant claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38 . Specifically, instant claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38 fall entirely within the scope of claim 8 of '537. Appellant claims that there is no technical or factual basis, however as cited supra, the claims of the instant application differ only through the claim

language of treating vision disorders; however, the basis of the treatment is "nerve related".

The scope of the instant claims is actually neurological disorders that effect vision and memory, not vision and memory disorders which affect neurological disorders. The scope of the claims is such that the treatment of the multitude of disorders set forth in the instant claims has no basis of treatment with the compounds of the invention without the recognition that the cause of these disorders, must be neurological (emphasis added). The terms "vision" and "memory" reference the biological system which is ultimately affected via treatment of a neurological or nerve related condition. As such, it would have been obvious that the method in claim 8 of '537 drawn to the treatment of a neurological disorder in an animal, using an analogous compound, to stimulate growth of damaged peripheral nerves or to promote neuronal regeneration would be useful in a method of treating a neurological disorder affecting either vision or memory. The examiner maintains the position that the scope of the instant claims drawn to treatment of nerve related conditions with the claimed compounds is encompassed by the use of the same class of compounds in '537 to treat or affect neuronal activity via stimulation of damaged neurons, promotion of neuronal regulation and treatment of a neurological disorder.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection- Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38

Appellant's arguments in the brief filed 4-2-02, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-11 and 23-38 under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Hamilton et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,140,357 is maintained for the reasons set forth below.

As cited *supra*, appellant' argues that the compounds claimed in '357 are different from those claimed instantly because the substituent at the 2-position is not permitted to be either an ester or amide and is not permitted to be further substituted. Appellant should note that the claim language of the instant claims specifically recites a carboxylic acid or carboxylic acid isostere. An isostere is a compound resulting from the exchange of an atom or a group of atoms with another, broadly similar, atom or group of atoms. As such compounds disclosed and claimed in '357 wherein a substituted carboxylate is present when Y= Oxygen is equivalent to an isostere of carboxylic acid, given that the only difference between the carboxylate and the carboxylic acid is the presence or absence of a hydrogen atom. Appellant's claim that the 2-position is not permitted to be either an ester or amide is also clearly refuted by the claims as the instant claims, specifically claim 11, recite an amide as a 2-position isostere (p.25 of claims), as well as phosphate esters (p. 35 of claims) as substituents. Thus applicant's assertion that the rejection should fall because the compounds of the invention are limited to carboxylic acids as 2-position substituents is not supported by the compounds recited in the instant claims.

Appellant further argues that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because there purportedly is no evidence of record that a compound useful for treating Alzheimer's Disease, Parkinson's disease and the other conditions cited in the references was expected to work for vision disorders or memory impairment.

Appellant presumes that the scope of the claims disregards the neurological etiology of the various conditions set forth in the instant claims, as well as that the prior art of record does not provide a showing to the treatment of neurological disorders or neuronal activity broadly. Appellant does not dispute that the compounds of the invention have been set forth in the prior art, it is disputed that these compounds would have been useful for treating a vision disorder; moreover, it is clear that the prior art of record indeed addresses treating nerve related memory impairment and thus establishes a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Thus the question is not whether the prior art specifically states a vision disorder, but whether the claim to treatment of a nerve related vision or memory disorder with the compounds of the invention would have been obvious to one of skill in the art.

Hamilton et al. ('357) teaches the use of the instant class of compounds for the treatment of neurodegeneration and conditions associated therewith in areas or organs readily accessible by topical applications, including neurological conditions of the eye (col.12, lines 59-67). Thus Hamilton et al. teaches the general neurological treatment uses of the instant compounds as well as the specific use for neurological disorders of the eye, which encompasses applicant's claims to "nerve related visual disorders".

Appellant should note that the prior art need not teach each and every limitation set forth in the claim to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, only provide a reason or motivation to combine the prior art in a manner necessary to produce the claimed invention, the reasoning may be implicit or explicit. Obviousness does not require absolute predictability. Obviousness does, however, require some relationship between the use taught in the reference and the use discovered by the applicant, *In re Merck & Co., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 1097, 231 USPQ 375, 379 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In *Merck* the reference compound and the claim compound were both known, and the uses were similar; the court held that the claimed use would be expected *prima facie* in light of the known use of the reference compound. Note, the court recognized similar uses, not identical uses as supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The scope of the instant claims is such that the treatment of the multitude of vision disorders set forth has no basis of treatment with the compounds of the invention without the recognition that the cause of these disorders, must be neurological or nerve related (emphasis added). If the vision and memory disorders were not "nerve related" as claimed, applicant's presumptions regarding no evidence towards the treatment of a visual disorder with the instant compound would be plausible. Appellant had previously amended the claims to include the neurological basis because it was clear that there was no support in the specification for the treatment of vision and memory disorders broadly with the compounds of the invention, i.e. glaucoma, cataracts, myopia, amnesia, which are all conditions which effect vision and memory, yet the compounds of the invention had no support for these conditions or the multitude of conditions which

are encompassed by the terms "vision and memory disorder". The scope of the claims is actually neurological disorders or neurodegenerative states that effect vision and memory, not vision and memory disorders which affect neurological disorders.

Appellant's arguments are based on the logic that even though the compounds of '357 are drawn to treating or effecting neuronal activity via stimulation of damaged neurons, promotion of neuronal regulation and treatment of a neurological disorder using the same FKBP-type immunophillin ligands of the instant claims, one of skill in the art presented with a neurological disorder which effects either vision or memory, would not have a reasonable expectation of success in the use of that compound to treat a nerve related vision or memory disorder.

Appellant would seek to limit the teachings of Hamilton et al. to peripheral neuropathies when it is clear that peripheral neuropathies is one subset of the broad use of the compounds with regards to nerve related diseases. Note, col. 11, line 55 – col.12, line 9, wherein it is specifically taught that "The novel compounds of the present invention...possess an excellent degree of neurotrophic activity. This activity is useful in the stimulation of damaged neurons, the promotion of neuronal regeneration, the prevention of neurodegeneration, and in the treatment of several neurological disorders known to be associated with neuronal degeneration and peripheral neuropathies. The neurological disorders that may be treated include but are not limited to myasthenia gravis....cervical spondylosis..... Gullain Barre syndrome.....Alzheimer's syndrome, and Parkinson's disease", or column 2, lines 39-65 wherein Hamilton et al. teaches " the present invention provides non-immunosuppressive compounds containing small

molecule FKBP rotamase inhibitors for enhancing neurite outgrowth, and promoting neuronal growth and regeneration in various neuropathological situations where neuronal repair can be facilitated". Moreover, as cited *supra*, the use of these compounds to treat nerve related eye disorders has been set forth by Hamilton et al., thus a *prima facie* case of obviousness is supported for claim language to nerve related vision disorders.

Appellant has stated in the brief p.9, that "Alzheimer's Disease is not a type of memory impairment, and nothing in the cited references suggests that it is". Applicant should note that assertions do not take the place of evidence; moreover, one of the *Graham v. Deere* factors of obviousness is resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. It has been clearly established in the art of neurological science that Alzheimer's is a type of memory impairment. The Teri et al., reference cited by applicant in the instant brief (p. 7) recognizes this fact, wherein the first line of Teri et al., clearly states that "Dementia of the Alzheimer's type is the most prevalent form of dementia". As defined by the Merck Manual, "Dementia is a chronic, slowly progressive illness resulting in loss of memory and a severe decline in all aspects of mental functioning....dementia is usually irreversible". It is quite clear that one of skill in the art would recognize a progressive loss of memory as a memory impairment. Appellant additionally argues that the limitations of claim 6 are not addressed in the prior art of record; however, assuming *arguendo*, that the claim is limiting, this claim can only be valid as a limiting claim if applicant intends that injury occurs somewhere other than the direct ophthalmologic site, such as the brain, and indirectly effects a nerve related vision

disorder. The state of the art as set forth in applicant's specification (p.2, lines 10-12) supports this indirect nerve related vision disorder as it states that "The visual system may be adversely affected by disorders correlating to physical injury to the eye, head, or other parts of the body resulting from external forces...". However the causation of the nerve related disorder, the disorder must requisitely be nerve related, therefore the teachings of Hamilton et al. as cited herein still apply.

Hamilton et al. provides additional motivation to one of skill in the art to use the compounds of the invention with disorders that are nerve related as Hamilton teaches that compounds of the invention do not exert any significant immunosuppressive activity in addition to their neurotrophic activity (col. 2, lines 55 - 65). The key feature of non-immunosuppressive activity in addition to neurotrophic activity, easily provides the motivation for one of skill in the art to use the compound for the treatment of nerve related disorders in different organ systems of a mammal, such as vision or memory, as long as the disorder is combated neurologically.

Appellant has not provided a response to these specific motivations supported by the prior art of record, nor provided a showing that the critical claim language of "nerve related" with regard to the disorders treated is outside the scope of the prior art of record.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Howard V. Owens  
November 19, 2002

  
James O. Wilson  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1623

Conferees  
  
Johann Richter, Ph.D. ESQ.  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1623

  
Samuel Barts  
Primary Patent Examiner

GARY M. NATH, ESQ.  
NATH & ASSOCIATES  
1030 FIFTEENTH STREET, N.W.  
SIXTH FLOOR  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005